

DATA EVALUATION RECORD

**SUCROSE
TRIMETHYLAMINE
YEAST
PUTRESCENT WHOLE EGG SOLIDS
INDOLE
(Bull Run Fly Attractant)**

**STUDY TYPE: General Considerations for Efficacy of Invertebrate Control
Agents (OPPTS 810.3000)**

MRID 47396903

Prepared for
Biopesticides and Pollution Prevention Division
Office of Pesticide Programs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
One Potomac Yard
2777 South Crystal Drive
Arlington, VA 22202

Prepared by
Toxicology and Hazard Assessment Group
Environmental Sciences Division
Oak Ridge National Laboratory
Oak Ridge, TN 37830
Task Order No. 08-031

Primary Reviewer:
Eric B. Lewis, M.S.

Secondary Reviewers:
Sylvia Milanez, Ph.D., D.A.B.T.

Robert H. Ross, M.S., Group Leader

Quality Assurance:
Lee Ann Wilson, M.A.

Signature: Eric B. Lewis
Date: JUL 27 2008

Signature: Sylvia Milanez
Date: JUL 27 2008

Signature: Robert H. Ross
Date: JUL 27 2008

Signature: L.A. Wilson
Date: JUL 27 2008

Disclaimer

This review may have been altered subsequent to the contractor's signatures above.

Oak Ridge National Laboratory managed and operated by UT-Battelle, LLC., for the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC05-00OR22725.

*I need to see
minutes of
pre-submission
meeting.*

DATA EVALUATION RECORD

EPA Secondary Reviewer:

STUDY TYPE:	General Considerations for Efficacy of Invertebrate Control Agents (OPPTS 810.3000)
MRID NO:	47396903
DECISION NO:	392213
DP BARCODE:	DP353134
TEST MATERIAL:	Bull Run Fly Attractant (a.i., 42.1% sucrose, 18.0% dried whole egg solids, 5.5% yeast, 0.2% indole, and 2.8% trimethylamine)
PROJECT STUDY NO:	Not provided
SPONSOR:	Bull Run Scientific, VBT, 7400 Beaufont Springs Drive, Suite 300, Richmond, VA 23225-5519
TESTING FACILITY:	Bull Run, LLC
TITLE OF REPORT:	Bull Run Fly Trap Attractant: Field Bioassays to Evaluate Efficacy, Effects on Non-Target Organisms, and Storage Stability
AUTHOR:	Smith, C.A.
STUDY COMPLETED:	April 2, 2008
CONFIDENTIALITY CLAIMS:	None
GOOD LABORATORY PRACTICE:	A signed and dated GLP statement was included. The data reported in the study do not comply with the requirements of 40 CFR Part 160. However, the data are believed to be adequate for pesticide registration purposes.
CONCLUSION:	Twenty field trials were conducted in Washington and California to determine the efficacy of fresh and previously-stored (12 months) Bull Run Fly Attractant (a.i., 42.1% sucrose, 18.0% dried whole egg solids, 5.5% yeast, 0.2% indole, and 2.8% trimethylamine) to attract "filth flies." Traps containing the test material were placed in fly habitats such as farms, ranches, and residences and examined after 3 to 31 days. Both fresh and old test material were efficacious compared to control traps containing no attractant, and trap location had more impact than test material age on the number of flies trapped. The test material was judged to be stable over 12 months of storage. There was no evidence that the test material attracted nontarget organisms, including honeybees.

CLASSIFICATION: Acceptable

Test Material

Bull Run Fly Attractant (a.i., 42.1% sucrose, 18.0% dried whole egg solids, 5.5% yeast, 0.2% indole, and 2.8% trimethylamine)

Product Description

Bull Run Fly Attractant is an end use product to be used as an attractant for "filth flies" such as house flies, blow flies, bottle flies, lesser house flies, cluster flies, lance flies, secondary screwworm flies, flesh flies, and false stable flies. The product is composed of a fly attractant mix (97.3% w/w) in a [REDACTED] The

pouch of attractant is contained in a disposable or reusable trap that is filled with the appropriate amount of water and hung in the treatment area).

Test Methods

Field trials were conducted to determine the efficacy, effect on nontarget species, and storage stability of Bull Run Fly Attractant (Table 1). Medium size traps (1.45 oz) were used in the trials. Each trial included one trap with freshly-produced attractant (July 20, 2007 for the WA trials and September 28, 2007 for the CA trials) and one trap with no attractant. Trials to determine storage stability included a third trap with attractant that was produced on July 10, 2006, and stored for 12 months under commercial warehouse conditions prior to the test. The trials used a randomized complete block design. All traps were hung approximately 1 meter above the ground and about 3 meters apart within the block. Blocks of traps were spaced about 10 meters apart.

Results Summary

Results are summarized in Table 1. Both fresh and 12-month-old attractant were effective compared to the controls. In some cases, fresh attractant provided larger catches, while in other cases the previously-stored attractant was more effective. Therefore, trap location was believed to have a greater impact than attractant age on the number of flies trapped. There was no evidence that the test material attracted any nontarget organisms, including honeybees or other beneficial insects. The odor of the stored attractant was judged to be identical to that of the fresh attractant, and there was no evidence of corrosion of the product packaging.

Study Author's Conclusions

The study author concluded that 1) the test material is effective as a fly attractant, 2) it can safely be used around beneficial insects and endangered species, and 3) it is stable during and after 12 months of storage under commercial conditions.

Reviewer's Comments

The reviewer agrees with the study author's conclusions regarding product efficacy and effects on nontarget organisms.

Note to EPA reviewer: The registrant proposes to use these efficacy data to support the product chemistry storage stability data requirement (OPPTS 830.6317). The reviewer does not know if this was previously agreed to by the Agency. The EPA reviewer will need to make a determination if the efficacy data are acceptable for this purpose.

Table 1. Results of field trials for Bull Run Fly Attractant							
Trial No. Start/end	Duration (days)	Trial Type ^a	Location	Site description	Number of trapped flies		
					Control	Fresh	Old
1 7/23 – 8/1/07	10	E, N, S	Spokane Co., WA	Alpaca farm	0	9000	3000
2 7/23 – 8/1/07	10	E, N, S	Spokane Co., WA	Residence where game fowl raised	6	1500	3000
3 7/24 – 8/7/07	15	E, N, S	Spokane Co., WA	Residence near chicken coop and horses	1	3000	3000
4 7/24 – 8/7/07	15	E, N, S	Spokane Co., WA	Residence between chicken coop and pig pen	0	3000	3000
5 8/1 – 8/8/07	8	E, N, S	Spokane Co., WA	Residence where game fowl raised	0	3000	3600
6 8/1 – 8/8/07	8	E, N, S	Spokane Co., WA	Residence where game fowl raised	0	3000	3600
7 8/1 – 8/31/07	31	E, N, S	Spokane Co., WA	Residence near chicken coop, goats, emus, sheep, chickens, and geese	0	7500	6000
8 8/1 – 8/3/07	3	E, N, S	Spokane Co., WA	Residence near chickens	0	18,000	12000
9 8/2 – 8/7/07	6	E, N, S	Spokane Co., WA	Residence near horses	0	6000	3000
10 8/8 – 8/6/07	4	E, N, S	Spokane Co., WA	Horse boarding and training facility	1	3000	9000
11 10/2 – 10/5/07	3	E, N	Spokane Co., WA	Dairy, near manure piles	6	40	NA
12 10/2 – 10/5/07	3	E, N	Spokane Co., WA	Dairy, near manure piles	0	150	NA
13 10/2 – 10/5/07	3	E, N	Spokane Co., WA	Dairy, near manure piles	0	30	NA
14 10/2 – 10/5/07	3	E, N	Spokane Co., WA	Dairy, near manure piles	30	3000	NA
15 10/2 – 10/5/07	3	E, N	Winton, CA	Calf ranch	2	100	NA
16 10/2 – 10/5/07	3	E, N	Winton, CA	Calf ranch	0	600	NA
17 10/2 – 10/5/07	3	E, N	Stevinson, CA	Cattle ranch	3	4500	NA
18 10/2 – 10/5/07	3	E, N	Lakeview, CA	Chicken farm near manure piles	7	250	NA
19 10/2 – 10/5/07	3	E, N	Lakeview, CA	Chicken farm near manure piles	0	6500	NA
20 10/2 – 10/5/07	3	E, N	Lakeview, CA	Pig farm	7	7500	NA

^aE = efficacy, N = nontarget organisms, S= storage stability
Data from pp. 8-9, MRID 47396903